



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

with from one-fourth to one-fifth of the whole time devoted to Latin, the student still needs the kind of assistance provided by this book? If we are prepared to admit this, does it not constitute the strongest indictment against our teaching of Latin that could be framed? And if we are prepared to admit this too, does it not follow of necessity that unless steps are taken to improve the situation we teachers of Latin are compromising our calling?

Professor Laing's second class of text books, he says, are those of the type of Furneaux's *Annals of Tacitus* and Tyrrell's correspondence of Cicero. I should like greatly to see books of this type published in the United States and what he says as to the possibility of such publications arising from the endowment of libraries and universities fills me with hope, though not with immediate expectation. At present I know of but a single elaborate edition of a classical author ('elaborate' in Professor Laing's definition) published in this country at the expense of any one other than the author himself. No doubt, however, Professor Laing knows that there is a school edition of Furneaux's *Annals of Tacitus* and that we thus have an exact example of what he desiderates. Those who believe in the justice of his contention are urged to examine the school edition of Furneaux and to compare it with this edition of the *Phormio*. G. L.

SLANG, ANCIENT AND MODERN¹

Every student of the life and literature of any past age must many times have felt how very old are countless 'new' things that we do and say, or, if you will, how fresh and modern was much, not to say *all*, of the life of the ancients; and more than that, how trite it is getting to be—nay, how trite it has been for centuries upon centuries—to say that 'there is no new thing under the sun'. Our age, and doubtless every past age save one, would fain pride itself on its originality, yet the representations of to-day and of yesterday, from Kipling back to Bacchylides, from the Hebrew Preacher down to Shakespeare, endorse, in effect, the words of the jingle, that it is 'the same thing over again'. We are told that Tennyson believed that "nothing can be said which has not been said in some form or another before", and even these very words of his illustrate the truth of his belief, for are they not almost identical with the familiar verse from Terence (*Eunuchus* 41):

Nullumst iam dictum, quod non sit dictum prius.

Of course, generally it is simply ideas that have permanency, and it is in their phrasing that novelty chiefly comes in; yet not rarely ideas and words alike, at some one's touch, come from out of what our opponents like to call the *dead* languages once more undecayed to life. And it is of some of these

apparent resurrections from the dead that I should like to speak. I shall restrict myself, in general, to one side of the subject—slang words and phrases and colloquialisms such as were known to the ancients and are likewise known to us to-day in practically the same form.

It certainly gives us a comfortable feeling to know that *putidum* and *σαπρόν* were used colloquially long before they were made vulgar by being adopted into our vernacular, that the ancients were familiar with rousing speeches and 'smooth' plays, with the art and the phrase of 'striking' a man for a present, as well as with the apparently gentler but really quite as effective 'touching' one's father for money. All these phrases, I say, carry reassurance with them, especially since some of them, at least, were in their day not slang but highly respectable usages.

To the inventor and user of slang two fields have proved most productive in all ages and among almost all nations: love and drunkenness. The reason doubtless is that the intoxicated person, whether tippler or lover, offers an easy mark for all sorts of barbed metaphors, and sometimes himself, in his exhilarated state, is extremely successful in escaping from bald literalism, in which escape some one has declared the essence of slang to lie. In English we have expressions almost beyond number drawn from both fields, which need not perhaps be enumerated. A writer of half a century ago gives a list of thirty-six slangy English expressions meaning drunken (by a strange sort of irony the article in which the list occurs appeared in a magazine called *Household Words*!) and this list of his is far from complete or up-to-date. Doubtless the number could be very nearly doubled from the slang of the present time. Indeed some two or three hundred expressions of this same meaning are listed by Farmer and Henly in their elaborate dictionary of slang.

But what about the ancients? We are accustomed to say that the Greeks, at least, practised moderation in drinking as in other things, yet I have found very nearly forty words and phrases of theirs meaning 'intoxicated', only part, it is true, slang—and this number, incomplete as it obviously must be, seems a bit large for a people who believed in 'nothing too much'. Among these phrases may be mentioned one from Archilochus (*Frag.* 74, Hiller-Crusius), who declares that he 'knows how to raise the beautiful strain, the dithyramb, when his soul is *electrified* with wine', *ὄλην συγκεραυνωθείς φένας*. Alcaeus, with his *τέργε πνεύματος ὄλην*, comes pretty close to the language of Chaucer in regard to the Miller's Wife:

As any jay she light was and jolif

So was her jolly *whistle well znette*.

Again we have Aristophanes saying in Plato's Symposium (176 B) that he was 'one of those that were *dipped* the day before' (*τῶν χθὲς βεβαπτισμένων*)

¹ This paper was read at the Second Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Washington, D. C., April 24, 1908.

and his phrase reminds us of Shakespeare's, for the drinker who is beyond the stage of being a fool, beyond the madman stage, and has reached the third degree—'drowned'. A kindred use is that of *βρέχω*, 'to wet'. Pindar apparently opens the way for its figurative use, *not* in reference to intoxication, however. Then Euripides's *Electra* (El. 326) speaks of Aegistheus as *μέθη βρεχθεῖς*, 'steeped or soaked in drunkenness'. And finally Comedy gives us *βεβρεγμένος*, with no qualifying noun, so far as appears, in just the sense of the modern 'soaked' (Eubul. 126 ap. Athen. i. 23 a b, etc.). Coupled with this participle we find (ibid.) *κεκωθωνισμένος*, a word which comes from *κῶθων* a Spartan soldier's drinking cup. 'In one's cups' would be almost as near as the English comes to this—unless indeed one might venture on 'canteened' to correspond. Another word from the soldier's life is often found in Theognis, *θωρηχθεῖς*, 'breastplated', or perhaps simply 'armed'. A variation on this idea again is *ἀκροθώραξ* 'armed at the top', or perhaps 'superficially armed', and so 'slightly drunken'. Our own tongue knows the same metaphor in its 'in one's armor', 'primed', 'cocked', not to mention the tipler's 'pocket pistol' (compare also the humorous passage in Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1132 ff.).

Most of the expressions thus far mentioned are merely more or less close resemblances to those of the English, but, when we say that a man 'takes the cake' for ingenuity or what not, it seems at first sight pretty clear that here we have a phrase borrowed directly or indirectly from the Greek symposium, and used in the slang sense even in Aristophanes. Thus in the *Knights* (276) the chorus says to Cleon: 'If you defeat him at shouting, you are the hip-hip-hurrah; but if he surpasses you in shamelessness, the cake is ours' (*ἡμέτερος ὁ πυραμοῦντα*). The scholiast carefully explains that this cake was one made of boiled honey and wheat, baked. Cakes of this sort people used as prizes for those that kept awake at a symposium. They were in the habit of vying at the symposia in the matter of ability to keep one's head up, and the man who kept awake till morning *ἐλάμβανε τὸν πυραμοῦντα*, 'took the cake'. Modern English lexicographers, however, say that our phrase is of comparatively recent origin and is derived from the cake-walk. If so, the likeness to the old Greek phrase may be merely a coincidence, though certainly a curious one.

The Romans, also, had many similar forms of speech. Such words as *temulentus*, *vinolentus*, *vinosus*, if we may judge from the way in which they seem to have been first used, were originally of slangy connotation, like the English 'winey', 'beery', 'groggy', although they later climbed to a higher position in linguistic society. Plautus presents several realistic scenes in which the words *madere* and *madidus* occur, with the sense of *βρέχεσθαι*,

βεβρεγμένος. Thus in the *Mostellaria* (319) Callidamates asks:

Ecquid tibi videor ma-m-ma-madere?

Compare also Pseudolus 1297:

Non vides me ut madide madeam?

These usages, I take it, were slang. But when Horace uses *uvidus* in his Odes (2. 19. 18; 4. 5. 39), although the underlying thought is the same, it would be hard to persuade most of us, even with those Chicagoan Echoes from the Sabine Farm still ringing in our ears, that "the most gentleman-like of the Roman poets" had used words which in his time had anything more than a colloquial coloring. And, of course, when we find *irriguum mero corpus* and *irrigare vino*, the presence of the ablatives assures us that these are merely metaphorical expressions and not yet slang. So many other polite phrases with *vino*, such as *vino obrutus*, *sepultus*, *gravis*, *oneratus*, need not be dwelt upon, although, like corresponding Greek phrases *ὄνυξ βεβαρημένος*, and others, they may suggest the English 'loaded' and 'jag'. When Petronius, however, says (67), *mulieres sauciae inter se riserunt*, he is presumably using a real vulgarity—one which looks at first sight like the modern *shot*, but as English etymologists connect the latter with *scot*—'a drink', we can mention as a parallel only the less common 'cut'. From this same writer (41) and from the same field of thought we have the phrase *staminatas duxi*, which apparently means 'I've had some good *stiff* ones',—drinks, of course.

In the sentimental phrases of love the Greeks and Romans were quite as prolific as we moderns. Ever since the days of Aristophanes, not to say how long before, fond lovers have been calling their sweethearts pet animal names: so the old woman in the *Plutus* (1010-1011) says that when her lover found her sorrowful he used fondly to call her 'ducky' and 'dovey' (*νηττάριον καὶ φάττιον ὑπεκορίζετο*). Plautus (*Asinaria* 664 ff.) gives us another sample of the same erotic zoology in extenso. The fair Philaenium is begging the slave Leonidas for the twenty minas that will assure the continuance of her own and Argyrippus's love affair; 'O give me the money', she says, 'apple of my eye (*ocellus*)', my rose, my life, my delight'. 'Well', answers Leonidas, 'call me your sparrowkins, biddy (*gallinam*), quail, your lamby, kidlet call me, or your little bossie (*vitellum*)'. And again a little later: 'Call me ducky, dovey, little tyke (*catellum*), swallow, daw, dear little sparrowkins'. Some of these words may have been inserted simply for comic effect, but I am inclined to think they are all real love terms. Parallels occur, of course, in many languages, as well as in many other similar passages in Greek and Latin.

But the animal kingdom is not the only one Cupid draws upon. A sweetheart may be, as in English, 'my honey' (*mel meum*, Plaut. *Bacch.* 1197. or

mulsa mea, Stich. 755) or just pure 'sweetness' (*suavitus*, *ibid.*) There were 'pearls', too, long before Bowery girls were ever heard of. Trimalchio, in that most modern style of his, tells us (Petron. 63), that his former master's favorite boy died, and he adds, 'A pearl he was, by heaven' (*mehercules margaritum*). Or again, as Lucretius remarks (4. 1163), if a lady is big and huge, she becomes in her lover's eyes *cataplexis*; that is, of course, 'a stunner'. Propertius (1. 20. 6) gives us 'flame' (*ardor*) in the sense of 'sweetheart', and he and Ovid both have what seems to be the equivalent of our word 'baggage' applied to mistresses; cf. Prop. 4. 3. 45-46 (Arethusa to Lycotas):

Romanis utinam patuissent castra puellis!
essem militae *sarcina* fida tuae.

'Would that camps were open to Roman maids! Then would I be your faithful baggage in your warfare'. See also Ovid Her. 3. 68 (Briseis to Achilles):

Non ego sum classi *sarcina* magna tuae.
'I am no great piece of baggage for your fleet'. In both these examples there is much of the literal meaning, but in both also it is soldiers' baggage that is referred to. Now as one of the earliest meanings of *baggage* in English is a *soldier's mistress*, and as another early use is the playful one, like *minx* or *rogue*, I think it may be well that there is some more or less direct connection here between the Latin and the English.

A similar playful use of another harsh term is found as early as the Odyssey (5. 182), when Calypso tells Odysseus that he is really a 'sinner', *ἀλιτρός*, to have such shrewd thoughts.

Still another sort of slang, the coined word, we seemingly have in Petronius (61) where Nicerus describes the object of his affection as *pulcherrimum bacciballum*, which the editors give up, but we might perhaps translate it 'She's the prettiest little umpty-umpty'! or, with reference to its possible derivation from *bac(c)a*, 'a peach'. The enthusiasm reminds one of Triton's description of Amymone in Lucian (D. M. 6. 1) as 'a right pretty thing', *παγκαλὸς τι χρῆμα*. Again, once more in Petronius (37), we are told that Fortunata was Trimalchio's 'all-in-all' (*Trimalchionis topanta est*); perhaps we might even say she was *the whole thing* to Trimalchio. Long before, in its more correct form, the expression was proverbial, for Herodotus (1. 122) says that Cyno, the foster mother of Cyrus the Elder, was 'as the saying goes, everything to him' *ἢν τέ οἱ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τὰ πάντα ἡ Κυνώ*.

'There are others', is another expressive modern phrase. But a fairly close parallel occurs, with the same withering contempt in it, as long ago as Homer. In the Iliad (1. 174) Agamemnon says to Achilles: 'Flee if you wish. I do not beg you to stay on my account. There are others with me, who will honor me', *παρ ἐτοί γε καὶ ἄλλοι*.

In the Odyssey (21. 251) Eurymachus, failing to string the bow, remarks 'I do not grieve so very much about the marriage, though sorry I may be: there are many other Achaean women', *εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ Ἀχαιίδες*. But closer still is the passage of Lucretius (4. 1173); 'No matter how beautiful your sweetheart may be, or you may think she is, doubtless there are others too' (*nempe aliae quoque sunt*).

In many other departments of life these parallelisms abound. We still 'make beds', although not as literally as the ancients did (*πεποιήται εὐνή*, Od. 7. 342). And if it be asserted that the persistence of this phrase is merely due to the conservatism of the housewife, we might mention that sailors still 'make sail' (*vela facit*, Aen. 5. 281), and ships still 'run before the wind' (*θεούσης νηός* Od. 3. 281). Sprinters, too, still start from 'scratch' (*ἀπὸ ῥύσης* Od. 8. 121), and, in the parlance of the sporting editor, men are still pugistically 'put to sleep' (*in soporem collocastis*, Plaut. Amph. 304). Most teachers can bear witness that there still live a few humans who have their 'brains in their heels' (*ἐγκέφαλον . . ἐν ταῖς πτέρναις* [Dem.] 7. 45). Folk still occasionally waste away to mere 'skin and bones' (*δαστῖα καὶ δέρμα*, Theocr. 2. 90; *ossa ac pellis*, Plaut. Aul. 564) and are still, sad to say, occasionally 'abandoned by the physicians',—at least in patent medicine advertisements (*derelictus a medicis*, C. I. L. 6. 68). Even to-day, when our warnings turn out right, we remark 'I told you so' (*dicebam vobis*, Sen. Apocol. 12) or we punctuate a narrative with a 'D'you see?' or brusquer 'See?' (*ὄρᾱς*, Luc. Peregr. 45); we 'die a-laughing', once in a great while (*γέλῳ ἔκθανο*, Od. 18. 100; *risu emoriri*, Ter. Eun. 432), or we perhaps greet a story from some amateur Munchausen with a 'Then I awoke!' (*κᾶτ' ἐγὼ γ' ἐξηγρόμην*, Ar. Ran. 51). Again we say 'I'll be off', just as did the Aristophanic Socrates (Nub. 887, *ἐγὼ δ' ἀπέσομαι*), or we feel like quoting, perhaps, when a book agent calls, a very literal rendering of the words of the untutored Strepsiades, *οὐκ ἀποδιώξεις σταντόν* (Ar. Nub. 1296).

And then how natural the long ancient list of intensives seems, both adjectives and adverbs, like 'atrocious' piece of cleverness (*atrocem . . . astutiam*, Plaut. Capt. 539), 'horrible' vigilance (*horribili vigilantia*, Cic. Att. 8. 9. 4); 'awfully' and 'dreadfully', *αἰνῶς*; *δεινῶς*; most 'desperately' skilful (*desperatum valde ingeniosus*, Petron. 68); gashed his leg 'in fine style', *διέκοψε τὸ σκέλος χρηστῶς πάνυ* (Menand. Geneva frag. 1. 48); 'inconceivably' well, *ἀμνηχανῶς ὥς εἰ* (Plat. Rep. 527 E); to love 'mightily' (*amare valide*, Plaut. Merc. 42); 'monstrously' patriotic (*φιλᾶσθῆναι ὑπερφυνῶς* Ar. Ach. 142); 'perfectly' filthy (*ρυντώσῃ ἀκριβῶς* Luc. Peregr. 36); scorch 'em 'royally' (*γεννικῶς κατ' αὐτοὺς* Luc. Char. 14).

Such are some of the countless parallels more or

less close that the Classics reveal. They seem to me to suggest various things. First of all, they give evidence of the existence of a great body of slang in Greek and Latin. No one, indeed, who knows his Aristophanes and his Plautus or Petronius would venture to suggest that anything else was the case. And there is doubtless very little reason for believing even that the ancients had any less slang than we, for as every new excavation and every new papyrus from Egypt abundantly shows, they were men of like passions with ourselves. Only, aside from the old schoolboy idea that the Greeks and Romans were automatons, not humans, our practice in Greek and Latin composition, with its inculcation of the constant necessity of *ὁρεπ* and *quasi, rls* and *quidam*, leads us naturally to believe that they were never venturesome in language without apologizing for it, and always steered clear of unusual words as Caesar warns one to do. And, of course, slang is nothing if not unusual and venturesome.

Further, on the side of their likeness, these parallels may help to show that at least an appreciable part of our current slang and colloquial speech is derivable from the Classics; that is, is due to our schoolboys and college men, and goes back to an original academic use. Of course, we must leave room for mere coincidence; many times and quite independently two or more nations in widely different ages may perfectly well have hit on phrases the same both verbally and in thought. We must take into account similarity of circumstances and of psychological processes. And on such grounds as these perhaps the majority of the resemblances quoted above should be explained.

But there are a number of reasons why we may think that in many other cases a more or less direct connection and not simple coincidence furnishes the real explanation, even though such connection cannot be traced out in full. An academic source and history and later popular use are not *a priori* incompatible. Many words in our language now popular were once learned. Again, many words which came obviously from the Classics, especially Latin or dog-Latin, although now in more or less respectable use, must originally have been colloquial or slangy, e. g. *nostrum*, *nincompoop*, *omniumgatherum*, *quidnunc*, *tandem*, *sophomore*. Most of these have been incorporated bodily, and their origin is easily recognizable. Where words are translated, however, the relationship is obscured. And yet in many phrases in common use we have obvious translations: *rare bird*, *Homer nods*, *sound mind in a sound body*, perhaps *willy-nilly* (*velim nolim, velit nolit*). A similar literary origin—not classical—is certain also for much English slang. Shakespeare is the source of some; so is the Bible—for example, of *Jehu*, *Jonah*, *raise Cain*, the two last, at least, thoroughly popular to-day. There is, therefore, rea-

son enough why some of our slang that resembles that of the ancients should be suspected of coming directly from them by way of translation, provided only that those who have studied Greek and Latin are likely to have performed such a service. And of this there can be but little doubt.

For students in school and college are unquestionably frequent users and coiners of slang, and at the same time greatly interested in certain sides of their Classics. Witness the numberless sonnets to fair Lalages that college papers publish, such punning schoolboy jokes as A motto for a young Ladies' Seminary—*iubet vicissim*¹; slang nicknames like *Dinnie* for *Eddie* from *δίνη* 'an eddy'; the batrachian college yell, *Brekekekex-coax-coax*. Numerous macaronic poems also show the same tendency of the undergraduate to turn his Classics to practical use.

The English undergraduate has both greater familiarity with the Classics than has the American and apparently an equally marked tendency to use slang, so that we may reasonably believe that he has done his share in translating ancient slang into English, as he certainly has in transferring Latin and Greek words bodily into present slang use. For example, among such learned English slang is *gyp*, a college servant, traditionally said to be derived from *γύψ*, 'a vulture', because of the cupidity of the class. *Kudos*, transliterated from *κῦδος* in Browning's fashion, is used in the sense of 'glory', 'prestige', and although the term has found considerable literary use, it must originally have been pure slang.

WILLIAM W. BAKER

Haverford College

LATIN WORD-ORDER AGAIN

Professor Preble's critique² of my earlier paper on order and emphasis in Latin deserves wide attention. It is gratifying to find that he concedes some of my contentions, notably the frequency of climax; this would include, I suppose, the climactic force of numerous connectives, such as *non modo . . . sed etiam*, and the like; and all this, as it seems to me, establishes my main assertion, that emphasis in Latin is, in general, progressive, forward-moving. My paper does not maintain that position determines emphasis absolutely, but that the Latin habit is to put the stronger or more significant word, phrase, or clause after the less important. It is conceivable that coordinate words, phrases and clauses might have been thus arranged, while the individual syntactical groups were built on the opposite principle; but this seems to me very unnatural, and therefore *a priori* very improbable. For the present, I am content to stand

¹ It might be noted that this pun plainly dates from a time since the introduction of the Roman method of pronunciation, as well as previous to the last decade's tremendous emphasis upon quantities, for *iubet vicissim* is not the sort of thing the trained modern vowel-marker would be guilty of.

² See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2, 110-114. Attention may be called also to a paper on Latin Word-Order, in The School Review for April, 1909, by Dr. C. H. Meader of the University of Michigan. C. K.